

Remarks/Arguments

Considering the outstanding Office Action, the applicant has amended the claims to more particularly define the invention. Claim 7 has been merged into claim 1, and claims 2 - 7 have
5 been canceled. Claim 1 is amended by adding a blower and describing in detail the related position of each component. The amendments do not introduce new matter and are fully supported by the specification and drawings as originally filed.

10 In Office Action, the Examiner rejects the invention under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over TAKIZAWA et al.(6,419,364) in view of MIYAMOTO et al.(6,443,575) and TABUCHI et al. (6,488,378). Applicants have carefully considered the rejection but it is most respectfully
15 traversed for the reason discussed below.

TAKIZAWA et al. disclose that two exhaust fans (16,16) are adjacent to the housing 9021 of the light source. However, it is obvious that only one fan covers the most parts of the front and rear end of the housing.
20 The speed of the fan must be high enough to provide the most parts of cooling streams for the interior and external of the housing. But the invention forms two streams by each fan to share the cooling loading. Besides, TAKIZAWA et al. don't show whether or not the housing
25 guides the cooling stream into the interior of the light source. On the contrary, the invention has a blower with an outlet facing the interior region of the light source to directly cool the light core. So the fixture of the invention quite differs from that of TAKIZAWA et al..

30 TABUCHI et al. also disclose that two exhaust fans (19,20) are adjacent to the light source. However, only the fan 19 covers the front and rear end of the light

source. The other mirror cooling fan 20 only cools down the emission unit. Therefore, the fan 19 must be high enough to provide the two cooling streams for the interior and external of the light source. In contrast, the invention forms two streams by each fan to share the cooling load. Besides, there isn't any structure guiding the cooling stream into the interior of the light source. Therefore, The cooling efficiency of TABUCHI et al. isn't better than the invention with a blower blowing directly the stream into the light core.

MIYAMOTO et al. disclose that an exhaust fan 11 is placed behind the light source. Although a duct 41 directs the air blown into the reflecting mirror 12 of the lamp from the outside of the inlet fan 25, only the exhaust fans 11 takes care of all cooling load including the interior and exterior region of the lamp. The speed of the fan 11 must be high enough to provide the two cooling streams for the interior and external of the light source. Hence, the fan 11 still can't reduce the noise. In contrast, the invention forms two streams by each fan to share the cooling load of the light source. The fans (20,30) needn't to maintain high speed to reduce the noise.

In view of the above corrections and further amendments, favorable reconsideration and allowance of claim now present in the application are most respectfully requested.

30

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu

Date: 12/11/2003

5 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No.41,526

P.O. BOX 506

Merrifield, VA 22116

U.S.A.

e-mail:winstonhsu@naipo.com.tw

10